

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 15, 2006. Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 20, 22, 27, 29 to 31, 33, 35 and 36 are pending in the application, with Claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19, 21, 26, 28, 32 and 34 having been cancelled herein. Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, 30, 31, 35 and 36 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies and thoughtful treatment afforded to Applicants' representative during the September 12, 2006, telephonic interview with the Examiner. Because the interview was impromptu, the interview included only a general discussion of the differences between the present invention and Aoki.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a formal interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 26, 28 to 32 and 34 to 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,396,284 (Freeman) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,424,772 (Aoki). Claims 6, 13, 20, 27 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Freeman and Aoki, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,621,429 (Yamaashi). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to receiving frame images from a camera and displaying the frame images automatically and independently of users control operation. One feature of the present invention includes detecting whether or not a current frame image displayed by a display unit is updated by a next frame image being received in a summary mode. In the summary mode, receiving one frame image from the camera

corresponds to displaying a flashing icon one time and display of a non-flashing icon corresponds to a period of time between receiving the one frame image from the camera and receiving a subsequent frame image from the camera. In this way, a user can more quickly assess when a currently displayed frame image is updated by a next frame image. This feature can be helpful, for example, in identifying disruptions of frame image reception from cameras while the cameras are operating.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 defines a communication apparatus. The communication apparatus comprises a reception unit for receiving frame images generated from a plurality of cameras via a network in a summary mode in which frame images generated from a plurality of cameras are displayed automatically and independently of users control operation, and an output unit for outputting the frame images received by said reception unit in order to display the frame images for each respective communication terminal on a display unit as multiple image displays corresponding respectively to each of the plurality of cameras. The communication apparatus also comprises a detection unit for detecting whether or not, for each respective camera, a current frame image displayed by the display unit is updated by a next frame image being received by the reception unit in the summary mode, and a notification unit for causing the display unit to display, for each respective one of the multiple image displays, an icon indicating an update state of the received frame images for the respective image display, wherein the icon is displayed on a predetermined area of the display unit at a time when the corresponding frame image is displayed. The notification unit causes a flashing icon to be displayed corresponding to an updating state when the detection unit detects that a current frame image displayed by the display unit is updated by

a next frame image, and causes a non-flashing icon to be displayed corresponding to a non-updating state when the detection unit detects that a current frame image displayed by the display unit is not updated by a next frame image. In the summary mode, receiving one frame image from the camera corresponds to displaying the flashing icon one time and display of the non-flashing icon corresponds to a period of time between receiving the one frame image from the camera and receiving a subsequent frame image from the camera.

Independent Claims 8, 22 and 35 are method claims, independent Claims 15 and 31 are apparatus claims, and independent Claims 29, 30 and 36 are storage medium claims which are seen to generally correspond to independent Claim 1.

The applied references are not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 29 to 31, 35 and 36, and in particular, are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of detecting whether or not a current displayed frame image is updated by a next frame image being received in a summary mode, in which frame images generated from a plurality of cameras are displayed automatically and independently of users control operation, and causing to display an icon indicating an update state of the received frame images, wherein in the summary mode, receiving one frame image from the camera corresponds to displaying a flashing icon one time and display of a non-flashing icon corresponds to a period of time between receiving the one frame image from the camera and receiving a subsequent frame image from the camera.

Freeman is directed to a motion detection system in which elements of a statistical array derived from an image are compared with corresponding array elements derived from an earlier image. The Office Action concedes that Freeman does not disclose

detecting whether or not a current frame image displayed is updated by a next frame image being received, or disclose or suggest causing to display a symbol indicating an update state of the received frame images, the symbol displayed in a first condition of a flashed icon corresponding to an updating state when the detection unit detects that a current frame image displayed is updated by a next frame image, and the symbol is displayed in a second condition corresponding to a non-updating state when the detection unit detects that a current frame image displayed is not updated by a next frame image.

The Office Action also concedes that Aoki does not expressly disclose a detection unit “to detect . . . whether the current frame is updated.” (Office Action, page 4). However, the Office Action asserts that “since Aoki et al teaches that a flashing icon is used to indicate a stand-by condition and a fully illuminated icon is used for the playback of video, it is therefore considered inherent if not obvious that some sort of detection unit must be used so as to detect . . . whether the current frame is updated in order to provide the subsequent flashing and fully illuminated icons.” (Id.) Applicants respectfully disagree.

Firstly, Applicants note that the Office Action fails to identify any express disclosure of a “detection unit” in Aoki, but rather asserts that “some sort of detection unit *must* be used.” (emphasis added). Accordingly, the Office Action’s assertion that a “detection unit” is disclosed in Aoki must rely on the principle of inherency, and therefore, must meet the significant burden that “the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art.” (MPEP § 2112(IV) (citations omitted) (emphasis in original)). Applicants submits that the Office Action fails to meet this

burden, since the mere display of icons does not necessarily require a detection unit “to detect . . . whether the current frame is updated.”

More importantly, Aoki actually teaches how and why the flashing icon and the non-flashing icon are displayed, which Applicants note, is accomplished *without* a detection unit “to detect . . . whether the current frame is updated.”

Specifically, Aoki teaches that the fully illuminated PLAY icon is displayed because the play switch SWP is pressed. (See column 25, lines 42 to 65 of Aoki). Similarly, Aoki teaches that the flashing PLAY icon is displayed because the play switch SWP is pressed. (Id.) Moreover, Aoki details the exact process of causing the display of the icons through the operation of various switches, including play switch SWP, in Figures 14A to 20. Specifically, Aoki teaches the specific operation of switches whereby “mode Number M is set to 1 (step 206). *This causes the PLAY icon on the LCD panel 15 to flash*”. (column 24, lines 47 to 49; Figure 19)(emphasis added). Likewise, Aoki another operation of switches whereby “mode Number M is set to 0 (step 209), *which illuminates the PLAY icon on the LCD panel 15*”. (column 25, lines 28 to 30)(emphasis added). Thus, not only does Aoki fail to disclose a “detection unit,” as the Office Action concedes, Aoki expressly teaches the specific operation of switches and conditions that cause the icons to be displayed.

Accordingly, Applicants disagree with the Office Action’s assertion that the mere display of a flashing icon in a stand-by mode and a fully illuminated icon in a playback mode requires a detection unit “to detect . . . whether the current frame is updated,” when in fact, Aoki clearly discloses otherwise. Moreover, Aoki’s display of icons is not seen to disclose or suggest a detection unit “to detect . . . whether the current

frame is updated,” much less disclose or suggest detecting whether or not a current displayed frame image is updated by a next frame image being received in a summary mode, in which frame images generated from a plurality of cameras are displayed automatically and independently of users control operation, and causing to display an icon indicating an update state of the received frame images, wherein in the summary mode, receiving one frame image from the camera corresponds to displaying a flashing icon one time and display of a non-flashing icon corresponds to a period of time between receiving the one frame image from the camera and receiving a subsequent frame image from the camera.

The remaining cited reference, namely Yamaashi, is not seen to cure the deficiencies of Freeman and Aoki, either alone or in any permissible combination. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, 30, 31, 35 and 36 are believed to be allowable.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frank L. Cire', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 120123v1

COPY